

Whereas, Donald and Dilla Manasse are celebrating the birth of their son, Joseph Bruno Manasse; and

Whereas, Joseph Bruno was born on the Twenty-third Day of September, 2003 and weighed 3.3 kilograms; and

Whereas, the Manasse's have all occasion to celebrate with friends and family as they welcome Joseph Bruno into their family, and

Therefore, I join with Members of Congress and their staff in congratulating Mr. and Mrs. Manasse and wishing Joseph Bruno a very Happy Birthday.

CONGRATULATING MIDDLE SCHOOL EDUCATORS OF THE YEAR

HON. RANDY "DUKE" CUNNINGHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 2003

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the educators honored by the California League of Middle Schools as "Educators of the Year." It is an honor to acknowledge the contributions they have made in the effort to implement education reform in California's middle school curriculum.

The California League of Middle Schools (CLMS) Educator of the Year Award Program annually recognizes the achievements of 11 educators from regions throughout California. Awardees exemplify educators who are able to inspire and motivate diverse groups of students in their educational endeavors. I am proud to nominate these eleven distinguished recipients of this award along with the thousands of educators from the State of California for the tremendous and exemplary work they do everyday in the classroom.

CLMS honors those displaying outstanding understanding of their teenage students and who are supportive of upward middle school movement. They are committed to employ the principles of Caught in the Middle, Turning Points, and Taking Center Stage, and incorporate State Frameworks and Standards into their curriculum. These leaders are dedicated to motivating and inspiring students while utilizing innovative educational tools. As enthusiastic role models, these educators are proactive in the pursuit of improving Middle School education for students now and in the future.

I am pleased to honor the following Middle School Educators: Jane Karcher, from Washington Middle School, Raiford Henry, from Roosevelt Middle School, Gabriele Calvin-Shannon, from Madison Middle School, Jami Phillips, from Woodland Park Middle School, Teresa Allen, from San Marcos Middle School, Julie Doria, from Olive Peirce Middle School, Mehrak Selby, from Marston Middle School, Steve Rodriguez, from Montgomery Middle School, John Lazarcik, from Kennedy Middle School, Lawrie Kueneman, from Oak Crest Middle School and Dr. Larry Maw from the San Marcos Unified School District.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to recognize the Middle School Educators of the year today for the outstanding contributions they have made to the education system. I thank them for their service and wish them continued success in the future.

TRIBUTE TO RUSSELL STOVER CANDIES

HON. SCOTT MCINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 2003

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to rise and pay tribute to an outstanding business in my district. Russell Stover Candies in Montrose, Colorado recently celebrated its thirtieth anniversary. Russell Stover is dedicated to bringing smiles to Americans throughout the nation and it is my honor to call the attention of this body of Congress to their contributions.

Russell Stover first opened the doors to its Montrose factory in 1973. Since that time, the staff and management have managed to find a delicate balance between traditional hand-craftsmanship and twenty-first century technology. The dedication and artistry that Russell Stover employees put into their work results in a product that is unparalleled.

Since its inception, Russell Stover has benefited the economy of Montrose. The 600 employees at the factory love their work and there is very little turnover. The length of tenure for the factory's employees is a testament to the loyalty the company has to its employees.

In addition to bringing joy to others through its production of candies, Russell Stover is also involved in the community. Each year, the factory dedicates time and resources to various non-profit organizations and charitable activities throughout the region.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to call the attention of my colleagues and our nation to Russell Stover Candies. The company has done a great deal for the betterment of the Montrose community. I would like to congratulate Russell Stover on thirty years of service in Montrose and wish them the best in the years to come.

TRIBUTE TO ROSE PELLGRIN

HON. GINNY BROWN-WAITE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 2003

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Rose Pellgrin, a dedicated, loving mother in my Fifth Congressional District of Florida. At 91 years old, Rose continues to be a shining example of devotion and selflessness for mothers young and old.

In 1949 at the age of 40, Rose Pellgrin became a mother to a baby girl she named Marian. Unfortunately Marian was born with a mental disability and Rose was advised that she would not live very long. Her doctors even told her to have another child and to not worry about Marian.

Rose insisted that she would raise Marian and did just that. She raised Marian despite several obstacles. When her husband's affliction with cancer forced the family to move from her native New York to central Florida, Rose learned that there was no school in the area for mentally disabled children. She then had to drive Marian to a school at the Key Training Center, nearly an hour away.

When her husband's cancer finally took his life, Rose had to make the difficult decision to place Marian at the Key Training Center to live and return to teaching, retiring at the age of 82.

Years later a nephew of Rose's who had a fondness for Marian died and left his inheritance to the women. Rose took the inheritance and bought a house with it. The house, which will become a licensed group home, will be maintained by the Key Training Center as one of its own group homes. This made it possible for Marian, and two other disabled adults, to have a place to live.

Mr. Speaker, with this act Rose Pellgrin made an incredible donation to the Key Center and to her daughter. What's more amazing is that she views it as nothing special, but as what mothers do for their children.

I am honored to be her representative in Congress and want to take a moment before this body today to call attention to her sacrifice and devotion to her daughter. We should all be so lucky as to have a mother like Rose.

WARS OF CHOICE

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 2003

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important debates now being carried on in the United States has to do with the reasons for our war in Iraq. The administration and its defenders have argued that we had to go to war as a matter of self-defense. In varying combinations, the administration has argued that Iraq was deeply involved with al Qaeda and that the Iraqi war to a great extent was a logical next step after the war in Afghanistan, and also that Iraq possessed weapons of mass destruction that were ready to be used against us. In short, they argued that this was a war of necessity.

Many of us believe to the contrary that the linkage between Iraq and al Qaeda was slight, and that the weapons of mass destruction argument had been grossly exaggerated. Of course evidence since America's military victory have strengthened greatly the case of those of us who were skeptical on both counts.

But the debate continues to be an important one. I was therefore struck by the article in the November 23 Washington Post by Richard Haass. Mr. Haass who is now the President of the Council on Foreign Relations was a very high ranking national security official of the Bush administration from its early months in office until June of this year—after the major military activity in the war against Iraq. While he does not explicitly rebut the Bush administration's case for the war, his article is in fact a strong argument against it.

Talking of the distinction between wars of necessity—which is how the administration has characterized the war in Iraq—and wars of choice, in which countries use war as a means of policy, Mr. Haass, the Director of the State Department's policy planning team while the war was being planned and carried out, clearly asserts that Iraq was an example of the latter.

As he notes, "the debate can and will go on as to whether attacking Iraq was a wise decision, but at its core it was a war of choice. We

did not have to go to war against Iraq, certainly not when we did. There were other options; to rely on other policy tools, to delay attacking, or both. Iraq was thus fundamentally different from World War II or Korea or even the Persian Gulf War, all of which qualify as wars of necessity." Mr. Speaker, the significance of this analysis from a man who occupied so high a post in the Bush administration is great, and because of that, I ask that Mr. Haass's very thoughtful article be printed here.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 23, 2003]

WARS OF CHOICE

(By Richard N. Haass)

Any number of lessons can be learned from the handling of the aftermath of the war in Iraq, but none is more basic than this: Democracies, in particular American democracy, do not mix well with empire.

Empire is about control—the center over the periphery. Successful empire demands both an ability and a willingness to exert and maintain control. On occasion this requires an ability and a willingness to go to war, not just on behalf of vital national interests but on behalf of imperial concerns, which is another way of saying on behalf of lesser interests and preferences.

Iraq was such a war. The debate can and will go on as to whether attacking Iraq was a wise decision; but at its core it was a war of choice. We did not have to go to war against Iraq, certainly not when we did. There were other options: to rely on other policy tools, to delay attacking, or both.

Iraq was thus fundamentally different from World War II or Korea or even the Persian Gulf War, all of which qualify as wars of necessity. So, too, does the open-ended war against al Qaeda. What distinguishes wars of necessity is the requirement to respond to the use of military force by an aggressor and the fact that no option other than military force exists to reverse what has been done. In such circumstances, a consensus often materializes throughout the country that there is no alternative to fighting, a consensus that translates into a willingness to devote whatever it takes to prevail, regardless of the financial or human costs to ourselves.

Wars of choice, however, are fundamentally different. They are normally undertaken for reasons that do not involve obvious self-defense of the United States or an ally. Policy options other than military action exist; there is no domestic political consensus as to the correctness of the decision to use force. Vietnam was such a war, as was the war waged by the Clinton administration against Serbia over Kosovo.

Wars of choice vary in their cost and duration. Vietnam was long (lasting a decade and a half from the American perspective) and costly in terms of both blood (more than 58,000 lives) and treasure (hundreds of billions of dollars). By contrast, Kosovo took all of 78 days, claimed no American lives in combat and cost less than \$3 billion.

What these experiences suggest is that the American people are prepared to wage wars of choice, so long as they prove to be relatively cheap and short. But the United States is not geared to sustain costly wars of choice.

We are seeing just this with Iraq. The American people are growing increasingly restless, and it is not hard to see why. We have been at war now in Iraq for some eight months. More than 400 Americans have lost their lives. Costs are in the range of \$100 billion and mounting.

The Bush administration knows all this; hence the accelerated timetable to hand over increasing political responsibility for Iraq to Iraqis. Such a midcourse correction in U.S.

policy reflects in part the political realities of Iraq, where enthusiasm for prolonged American occupation is understandably restrained; even more, though, the policy shift reflects political realities here at home. Domestic tolerance for costs—disrupted and lost lives above all—is not unlimited. As a result, the president is wise to reduce the scale of what we try to accomplish. Making Iraq "good enough"—a functioning and fairly open society and economy if not quite a textbook model of democracy—is plenty ambitious.

None of this is meant to be an argument against all wars of choice. There may be good and sound reasons for going to war even if we do not have to, strictly speaking. Such reasons can range from protecting a defenseless population against ethnic cleansing or genocide to preventing the emergence of a threat that has the potential to cause damage on a large scale.

But wars of choice require special handling.

First, it is essential to line up domestic support. Congress and the American people need to be on board, not just in some formal legal way but also to the extent of being psychologically prepared for the possible costs. Better to warn of costs that never materialize than to be surprised by those that do.

Second, it is equally essential to line up international support. The United States needs partners: to facilitate the effort of fighting the war, to share the financial and human costs of war and its aftermath, to stand with us diplomatically should the going get tough. We possess the world's most powerful military and economy, but the United States is not immune from the consequences of being stretched too thin or going deeply into debt.

Third, no one should ever underestimate the potential costs of military action; no one should ever assume that a war of choice, or any war, will prove quick or easy. Here as elsewhere the great Prussian military theorist Carl von Clausewitz had it right: "There is no human affair which stands so constantly and so generally in close connection with chance as war."

PLEDGING CONTINUED UNITED STATES SUPPORT FOR GEORGIA'S SOVEREIGNTY, INDEPENDENCE, TERRITORIAL INTEGRITY, AND DEMOCRATIC AND ECONOMIC REFORMS

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 2003

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Georgian President Eduard Shevardnadze resigned on November 23, 2003. Mr. Shevardnadze's resignation caps a political career during which he has won my admiration, and that of freedom-loving people everywhere, for helping, as Soviet foreign minister under Mikhail Gorbachev, end the Cold War.

However, in spite of this remarkable accomplishment, during his 10 years as president, Georgians widely became disheartened with Mr. Shevardnadze for allowing corruption to infest the country, while most of its people fell into poverty and despair. These conditions fed the uprising against him, but it was triggered by the fraudulent parliamentary elections of November 2, 2003.

Opposition began daily protests that attracted thousands, demanding the elections be

annulled or Mr. Shevardnadze's resignation, or both. Throughout nearly 3 weeks of protests, both sides remained mindful of Georgia's interest in peace and safety, and avoided provocations.

Mr. Speaker, his fall ended a political crisis astonishing for its speed and lack of violence in a blood-washed region. There was no blood. No killing.

Consequently, Mr. Speaker, this resolution congratulates both Eduard Shevardnadze and the leaders of the opposition, Nino Burdzhaneladze, Mikhail Saakashvili, and Zurab Zhvaniva, for their courage and patriotism in dealing with the crisis bloodlessly.

Moreover, the resolution pledges support and help for the people of Georgia so as to consolidate the democratic process. Furthermore, it urges all political segments, as well as social sectors and institutions in Georgia, to strive, through dialogue, to achieve the national reconciliation for which both the Georgian people and the international community yearn.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly and wholeheartedly support Georgia's new leaders, while I also urge them to pursue stability, abide by their constitution and hold democratic elections.

And, I look forward to working with Interim President Nino Burdzhaneladze in her effort to maintain the integrity of Georgia's democracy as she strives to ensure that this change in government follows the constitution.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO EARL VANTASSEL

HON. SCOTT MCINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 2003

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise before you with a heavy heart to pay tribute to a remarkable man from my district. Earl VanTassel of Craig, Colorado passed away recently at the age of 85. Earl contributed a great deal to the Craig community, and it is my honor today to rise and pay tribute to his life before this body of Congress and our nation.

Earl was born in Craig in 1918. He attended Craig High School, where he graduated in 1937. In 1943, Earl married Florence Prather, his wife of sixty years. Earl and Florence raised four wonderful children together.

Earl was an excellent and knowledgeable rancher who used his expertise for the betterment of his community. He was a mentor and leader for 4-H participants, and in that capacity, he passed along his knowledge of livestock and ranching to young people throughout the region. Earl was also a dedicated volunteer at the Moffat County Fair, numerous livestock sales, and local rodeos. He delighted in helping with the Craig Sale Barn for many years. In addition, Earl was an active member of the Colorado Cattlemen's Association, the Young Farmers Association and the 4-H Foundation.

Earl's contributions to his community went well beyond ranching. As a member of Colorado's first Conservation Board, Earl worked tirelessly on behalf of the environment. In addition, Earl served over forty years as a member of Craig's Rural Fire Protection District